

*OK to take  
OT*  
**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**FEB 12 2007**

60,469-250  
OT-5166

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: Fargo, Richard  
Serial Number: 10/564,873  
Filed: 01/17/2006  
Group Art Unit: 3654  
Examiner: Kruer, Stefan  
Title: SHOCK ABSORBING HITCH

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action that was mailed on December 14, 2006. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

**The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based upon *Fuller, et al.***

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the claims are anticipated by a *Fuller, et al.* reference. The Office Action states that the Examiner is applying the '824 *Fuller, et al.* reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102, however, it appears from page 4 of the Office Action that the Examiner is actually applying the '945 *Fuller, et al.* reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Regardless of which reference was intended, neither reference establishes a *prima facie* case of anticipation against any of Applicant's claims.

The *Fuller, et al.* '945 reference is silent regarding any relative relationship between the springs 52 and the springs 54. Therefore, it is not a reasonable interpretation of the reference to conclude that the active elevator hitch 36 operates in the manner suggested by the Examiner on page 2 of the Office Action. The *Fuller, et al.* '945 reference is focused on an active elevator hitch that responds to elevator motion control signals. There is nothing in the reference